



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/828,587	03/29/2001	Shu-Huar Joseph Yeh	2066P/SVL920010013US1	6604

7590 10/28/2003  
SAWYER LAW GROUP  
P.O. Box 51418  
Palo Alto, CA 94303

EXAMINER

VO, TED T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2122

DATE MAILED: 10/28/2003

3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/828,587

Applicant(s)

YEH, SHU-HUAR JOSEPH

Examiner

Ted T. Vo

Art Unit

2122

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 March 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is in response to the application filed on 3/29/2001.

Claims 1-14 are original claims.

Claims 1-14 are pending in the application.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson, "The Profile Name Service", 1988.

As per claim 1:

Peterson discloses a Profile Naming Architecture (creation tool) (Page 343, Figure 1) that provides accessibility to a collection of resources (applications) (Page 343, Figure 1, Access resource by Name).

The architecture provides that each naming resource is created by a corresponding principle (A component) (see page 343, line 2, 'Denote P', and see section 2.1, Attributes for {attribute1, attribute2,...} → p). Peterson's teaching covers the claim limitation:

**"An application creation tool (Page 343, Figure 1), comprising: a first Component (see page 343, section 2.1, for each p for example p1: will be {attribute1, attribute2,...} → p1), wherein a name of the first component in accordance with a naming scheme is based on a plurality of attributes for an application which the first component creates (see {attribute1, attribute2,...} → p); and a second**

Art Unit: 2122

**component** (see page 343, section 2.1, for each p, for example p2: will be {attribute11, attribute22,...} → p2) , wherein a name of the second component in accordance with the naming scheme is based on the plurality of attributes for the application (see { attribute1, attribute2,...} → p) which the second component creates".

Peterson teaches a creation of a collection of resources that is accessed by naming service based on a generic set of attribute principles.

Peterson lacks addressing about application creation. However, Peterson's naming service accesses an arbitrary collection of resources for conforming to attribute principle (see page 346, four sets, particularly see page 359, section 5,1,7).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to include an application that conforms to attribute principle in the teaching of Peterson for easing accessibility. Doing so would easily and directly access an application based on naming profile.

As per claim 2: Regarding, "*The application creation tool of claim 1, wherein the plurality of attributes comprises at least one of: a programming language; an application type; a server type; and a service type*", Peterson teaches a generic set of {attribute1, attribute2,...} for a resource principle p.

Peterson does not address attributes as "an application type; a server type; and a service type",

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to include a particular set of attributes that is inherent in the principle a given resource as disclosed by Peterson for conforming to the requirement of the principle.

As per claim 3: Regarding, "*The application creation tool of claim 1, wherein the first component is a first Java class*", Peterson does not address a first Java class. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to include a principle (given that a principle in a set of principles being first Java class) as a Java class because Java class includes attributes conforming to the standard of as set by the principle.

As per claim 4: Regarding, "*The application creation tool of claim 1, wherein the second component is a second Java class*", Peterson does not address a second Java class. It would have been obvious to a

Art Unit: 2122

person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to include a principle (given that another principle in a set of principles being second Java class), as second Java class because Java class includes attributes conforming to the standard of as set by the principle.

As per claims 5, 9, 12: Claim 5, claim 9 and claim 12 are a system, a method and a computer readable medium, respectively, that have the claiming functionality corresponding to the application tool as recited by claim 1. Claim 5, claim 9, and claim 12 are rejected in the same reason as set forth in connecting to the rejection of claim 1.

As per claims 6, 10, 13: Claim 6, claim 10 and claim 12 are a system, a method and a computer readable medium, respectively, that have the claiming functionality corresponding to the application tool as recited by claim 2. Claim 6, claim 10, and claim 13 are rejected in the same reason as set forth in connecting to the rejection of claim 2.

As per claim 7: Claim 7 is a system that has the claiming functionality corresponding to the application tool as recited by claim 3. Claim 7 is rejected in the same reason as set forth in connecting to the rejection of claim 3.

As per claims 8, 11, 14: Claim 8, claim 11 and claim 14 are a system, a method and a computer readable medium, respectively, that have the claiming functionality corresponding to the application tool as recited by claim 4. Claim 8, claim 11, and claim 14 are rejected in the same reason as set forth in connecting to the rejection of claim 4.

### ***Conclusion***

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.  
**Edelstein et al., US No. 6,101,537.**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ted T. Vo whose telephone number is (703) 308-9049. The examiner can normally be

Art Unit: 2122


reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM ET. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Dam, can be reached on (703) 305-4552.

The fax phone numbers for this Group are:

Official: (703) 746-7239; After Final: (703) 746-7238; Non-Official: (703) 746-7240.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

TTV  
October 17, 2003



**TUAN DAM**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**